

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-7 have been amended accordingly.

Claim 1 has been rejected because “media data filing information” has insufficient antecedent basis and because it is not defined. In response, “media data filing information” has been amended to “a stream of media data filing information”. Since the term now has proper antecedent basis, the rejection is now improper and should be withdrawn.

In addition, the term “media data filing information” is a term that would be clearly understood by those of skill in the art. The “media” would clearly be the storage media of the hard drive. The “data filing information” would clearly be the information stored within the media. Media data filing information is clearly exchanged with hard drives as information streams.

Claim 1 has been rejected for reciting the limitation “HD”. In response, “HD” has been replaced with the term “hard drive”. Since the term “hard drive” would be clearly understood by those of skill in the art, the rejection is now improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been rejected for use of the limitation “the headsets” in lines 4 and 7. In response, “the headsets” has been replaced with “a plurality of headsets”. Since proper antecedent basis has now been established, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been rejected for use of the limitation “the sectors” in line 6. In response, “the sectors” has been replaced with “a plurality of sectors of the hard drive”. Since proper antecedent basis has now been established, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been rejected for use of the limitation “the idleness” in line 7. In response,

the term “the idleness” has been replaced with “an idleness of the headsets during transfer of the media data filing information through the continuous use of each of the plurality of headsets”. Since proper antecedent basis has now been established, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been rejected for use of the limitation “which implies”. In response, “which implies in” has been replaced with the limitation “under”. Since proper antecedent basis has now been established, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 has been rejected for use of the limitation “the data filing surfaces” in line 9. In response, the term “in the data filing surfaces” has been replaced with “within a plurality of data filing surfaces of the hard drive”. Since proper antecedent basis has now been established, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 has been rejected for not setting forth any steps and under 35 U.S.C. §101 for an improper definition of a process. In response, the term “the simultaneous use of the headsets in data transfers” has been replaced with the method step of “the simultaneous use of the headsets in transferring data between the sectors and an integrated drive electronics”. Since claim 3 is now clearly directed to a method step, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 has been rejected for being in improper form by incorporating “figure 2” in line 2. In response, the term “figure 2” has been deleted. Since claim 4 is now in proper form, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 has been rejected for not setting forth any steps and under 35 U.S.C. §101 for an improper definition of a process. In response, claim 5 has now been further limited to the method step of “transferring signals of information between the same surface and an integrated

drive electronics". Since claim 5 is now clearly directed to a method step, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 has been rejected for not setting forth any steps, for incorporating an improper definition of a process and for being in improper form. In response, claim 6 has now been further limited to the method step of "a simplified device simultaneously transferring information between the plurality of sectors and respective headsets of the plurality of headsets". Since claim 6 is now clearly in proper form and directed to a method step, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

New claim 8 has been added. New claim 8 is supported in the specification at least on page 2, lines 14-26.

Closing Remarks

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Primary Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Primary Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or

even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. A duplicate copy of this sheet(s) is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By



Jon P. Christensen

Registration No. 34,137

November 18, 2005  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 655-1500